



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

A-5

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/187,551 11/05/98 MUSAKA K AM524R1/T289

IM22/1031

PATENT COUNSEL, M/S 2061  
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT  
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.  
P.O. BOX 450A  
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

EXAMINER

PADGETT, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

14

DATE MAILED:

10/31/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	69/187,951	Applicant(s)	Musaka et al
Examiner	M.L. Parlett	Group Art Unit	1762

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

### Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/16/00 and 8/17/00

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-10 + 27-29 + 31-34 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-10, 27-29 + 31-34 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 08/259,584.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1762

(1) The request filed on 8/17/2000 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/187/551 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

(2) In accordance with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1), a supplemental reissue oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

Claims 1-10, 27-29 and 31-34 are rejected as being based upon a defective declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251. See 37 CFR 1.175. The nature of the defect is set forth above.

Receipt of an appropriate supplemental oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) will overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251. An example of acceptable language to be used in the supplemental oath/declaration is as follows:

"Every error in the patent which was corrected in the present reissue application, and is not covered by a prior oath/declaration submitted in this application, arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant."

(3) The original patent, or an affidavit or declaration as to loss or inaccessibility of the original patent, must be received before this reissue application can be allowed. See 37 CFR 1.178.

(4) Since amendment A of 12/22/99 did not comply with 37 CFR 1.121(b), and the claims that were written out, but not actually amended in amendment B of 6/13/2000 do comply (ie. claims 28-29, 30 and 33-34), these claims have been substituted for the improperly presented claims of amendment A (12/22/99), hence correcting this problem in the file.

Art Unit: 1762

(5) Claims 27-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 27, while applicant has differentiated “a layer” of line 1 from “another layer” of line 8, as well as “a plasma...reaction” (line 6) from “another plasma... reaction” (line 9), in line 11 “the layer” and “the....reaction” are vague and indefinite, because they can refer to either of the previously introduced limitations, and it is unclear which is intended.

In claim 33, line 2 “tetraethylorthosilicate” is objected to, as lacking a correct article showing its antecedent basis in line 3 of claim 27.

(6) Claims 27-29 & 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc., 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Clement, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); Ball Corp. v. United States, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

In order to make the claims allowable over the prior art in parent application 08/259,584, the specific halogen F, as well as the specific type of fluorine source, CX<sub>4</sub> or CX<sub>3</sub>-(CX<sub>2</sub>)<sub>n</sub>-CX<sub>3</sub> were added to the claims, as well as the minimum concentration of F in

Art Unit: 1762

the deposited silicon oxide. The new claims introduced in the reissue broaden the scope of the claims to include all types of halogens from any source and do not require a minimum [F]. Furthermore, while the new claims, as exemplified by claims 27, relate the deposition of a layer deposited from gases comprising Si, O and halogen to "a desired stress" or "a tensile stress", this stress and the concentration of fluorine are inherently related, as can be seen in applicant's graphs (Figs 9-13) or in Homma (EPO 517,548 or USPN 5,288,578) in col. 4 of the EPO references, hence removing the concentration and source limitations is recapture. That applicant is stating an effect caused by the [F] previously claimed is essentially paraphrasing in order to broaden the claims, ie. recapture of previously excluded limitations or conditions.

To restate the issue, controlling the stress is intimately related to controlling the F concentration, hence to claim stress with no clearly defined metes and bounds, or even starting at  $-1.25 \times 10^9$  dynes/cm<sup>2</sup> in essence recaptures [F] that were excluded by limitations in the patented claims, as can be easily seen by comparing values in Figures 10 and 13.

As pointed out in the advisory, applicant's arguments concerning the various stresses ARE NOT supported by their specification, nor has any prior art been supplied to support their arguments and allegations. Note that how any evidence provided relates to what is actually disclosed should be clearly delineated, especially for any re-evaluation of recapture (or new matter) rejections.

Art Unit: 1762

Note that claims 34 dependent on 33 contain the limitations of the patented claims that have been deleted from the new independent claims. Claims 28-29 and 32-33 which replace part, but not all the recaptured limitations are insufficient to remove them from this rejection.

(7) Claims 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The added claims still contain new matter. Specifically in claim 27, the claim of generic layer deposition, "a tensile stress instead of a compressive stress" and is not supported by the original specification. In the matter of "intrinsic stress", the only mention of this term is found in the background (col. 3, line 35), when discussing prior art. Col. 6, lines 40-45, discuss  $1 \times 10^9$  dynes/cm<sup>2</sup> as compressive stress, seemingly contradicting applicant's comments on tensile stress values on p. 5 of the response of 12/22/99. When discussing the inventive process, all terms involving stress either have no modifier (Figure 13; col. 4, lines 46-49; and col. 9, lines 28-30) or are "compressive" (col. 6, lines 43-45; col. 8 lines 23-25 and 66-col. 9, line 6), which would imply that all are compressive if any particular kind of stress must be named. For these reasons, the claims contain New Matter. In applicants' response of 12/22/99, they cited fig. 13 for showing their comparison of stresses, and discuss which values are which, however the specification does NOT support their

Art Unit: 1762

allegations as written. While further discussion of stresses is present in the 6/16/00 response, it still consists of unsubstantiated allegations with unclear (if any) relationships to the original specification. If there is some inherent meaning that is not clearly set forth in the original specification, a prior art reference clarifying the issue or a sworn affidavit supplying it and explaining its inherency with respect to the specification would be acceptable for cleaning up this issue. Note the claims of tensile stress less than  $0.4 \times 10^9$  dynes/cm<sup>2</sup>, while applicants' p. 5 response of 12/22/99 states that at a 600 sccm C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>6</sub> flow, the stress becomes tensile stress at about this same value, hence the over all response arguments do not appear to be consistent with claims.

Claims 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being based upon new matter added to the patent for which reissue is sought. The added material which is not supported by the prior patent is as discussed above.

(8) The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:  
Applicant's graph in Fig. 13 and discussion thereof (as well as Fig. 3 to SN 08/691,983 in Novak et al) have negative stress values, that lacking any prior art supported explanation or the like, appear to be scientifically incorrect. If applicant's have an explanation for this, please supply a prior art reference or other supported means to clarify the issue, otherwise it appears that the values shouldn't be negative, but just down an order to magnitude, otherwise the scales don't make sense, because  $0 \times 10^9 = 0$ , giving a discontinuity not properly explained by the specification nor properly illustrated by the graph, ie. an

Art Unit: 1762

incredibly broad jump from  $0.5 \times 10^9$  to  $-0.5 \times 10^9$ . So are values really going from  $+0.5 \times 10^9$  dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> to  $-1.25 \times 10^9$  dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> (Musaka et al. Fig. 13), or is this an artifact from somebody's attempt to simplify the numbering on the axis? In the other application that appears to have provided the original claim language as previously discussed (the specification lacking any prior art supported explanation or the like), Figures 3 and 4 appear equally erroneous, having positive and negative values all to the power of 10<sup>9</sup> and in dyne/cm<sup>2</sup>. The examiner suspects that values that would make more sense are 0 is 0.1, .5 is 0.05, 1.0, etc., but sees NO enablement for this in the specification. The examiner also wonders if Fig. 9 is accurately labeled (hence is claim 9 correct?), because saying the decreasing of the ratio of F in the reactants, increases the atomic % F deposited is scientifically questionable. Commonly seen values for internal stress for F-containing SiO<sub>2</sub> deposits, from plasma and other CVD depositions are noted with  $2 \times 10^8$  dyne/cm<sup>2</sup> (See Homma's 5,288,518; col. 3, line 42-45) being exemplary, and probably related in some fashion to what applicant's values should have been.

Appropriate correction is required.

(9) The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1762

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

(10) Claims 1-10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 29-33, 38-40 and 42-45 of copending Application No. 08/888,499 . Although the conflicting claims are not identical to the 888,499 case under appeal, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of reasons stated in paper no. 4, section 8. Applicant's stated intent to file the terminal disclaimer is noted (p. 4 of 12/22/99 response), and still awaited.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

(11) The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 1762

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

(12) Claims 27-28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or (e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Homma (EP0517,548A2 or USPN 5,288,518).

Homma teaches the formation of fluorine-containing silicon oxide films where the internal stress is  $2 \times 10^8$  dynes/cm<sup>2</sup> (which is less than  $4 \times 10^8$ ) and the dielectric constant is about 3.7. Several methods of deposition are taught including plasma CVD via a parallel plate reactor and using reaction gases of O<sub>2</sub>, TEOS and FSi (OCH<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, called fluorotriethyloxysilane, but could also be called triethylfluorosilicate, so abbreviation could be FTEOS, FTES or TEFS. Homma uses flow controller, bubblers and nitrogen gas to introduce the reactant gases into the reaction chamber, hence the flow rates are selected and controlled, so for the conditions used, it is seen that the film properties produced are known, ie. predetermined. See Figure 3 and col. 4, lines 8-57 in the EPO reference which is a statutory bar. The US Patent has like teachings, but is the (e) reference. Note the uncertainty over what applicants mean by their stress is the only reason for the 103 aspect

Art Unit: 1762

of the rejection, and different measurement for different stresses would be expected to show correspondence.

(13) Claims 1-10, 27-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiyama et al.

Nishiyama et al also teaches deposition of silicon oxide containing F, where plasma CVD, including dual frequency or high density plasma, are used (summary, esp. col. 2, lines 30-60 and col. 3, lines 31-56 and 66-col. 4, line 6). Explicit teachings that [F] in the SiO<sub>2</sub> film "can be easily controlled by controlling the flow rate of the source gas" (col. 3, lines 53-56), with example 1 (col. 5-7) teaching reactant gases of TEOS + O<sub>2</sub>+NF<sub>3</sub> where NF<sub>3</sub> flow rates of 50 sccm, 100 sccm, 150 sccm and 2005 sccm produced atomic % of about 2, 3, 4 and 5, respectively (col. 6, lines 36-50). Col. 7 provided alternate F-source teachings of CF<sub>4</sub>, C1F<sub>3</sub>, SiF<sub>4</sub> and FSi(OC<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, and discussion of other reactant combinations also showing flow rate dependance for [F] deposited. As dopant concentration of fluorine in the silicon oxide deposit of Homma would have been expected to effect the stress level as discussed above, as well as the dielectric constant which Nishiyama also discusses, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that as flow rate of the F-source has been shown by Nishiyama et al to be related to the amount of fluorine deposited, then controlling and adjusting flow rate in order to maintain or produce desired film properties dependent on the [F], such as the dielectric constant or

Art Unit: 1762

the stress, would have been expected to be an effective and efficient way to produce consistent and desired results.

While Nishiyama et al does not include CF<sub>3</sub>H or other fluorocarbon containing hydrogen in the non-exclusive list of other possible fluorine sources, these compounds are analogous or homologous to the CF<sub>4</sub> explicitly taught, hence would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as useful alternatives, because they would have been expected to produce the same trend for [F]/stress effects, using routine experimentation to determine their desirable flow parameter, etc. No advantages were found in applicant's specification for using partially hydrogenated fluorocarbons and excluding perfluorinated ones, and all presented measurements used C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>6</sub>, now excluded from claims 1-10 or 33-34.

It was noted in the parent case's reasons for allowance that Nishiyama et al was differentiated over by the allowed claims in P.N. 5,571,571, because of the use of different precursor materials, however a closer reading of Example 1 (discussed above) showed that the TEOS + O<sub>2</sub> + NF<sub>3</sub> reactant gases were explicitly taught to have effective alternatives for the taught and claimed deposition, with CF<sub>4</sub>, a previously claimed fluorocarbon being specifically suggested as an alternative for NF<sub>3</sub>, and various atomic % ranging from 2-5% suggested to be deposited dependent on flow rate. The more general teaching on col. 2, lines 53-54 also suggest NF<sub>3</sub>, CF<sub>4</sub> and C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>6</sub> alternately as other F-sources, hence it would have been abundantly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 1762

substitute the claimed fluorocarbon compounds for NF<sub>3</sub> in the Nishiyama teaching to produce films by processes as claimed. Also note in col. 6, lines 12-25 of example 1, A1 wiring, ie. spaced conductive lines, were formed on the substrate prior to the claimed and taught deposition. Any useful line width would have been expected to be used.

Nishiyama et al's example 6 teaches dual frequency plasma deposition with frequencies as claimed, but a different set of reactant gases (FSi(OC<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>3</sub>+O<sub>2</sub>), however in example 1 on col. 7, lines 22-34, these gases we explicitly taught as possible alternatives to the TEOS + NF<sub>3</sub> combination, hence are of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the alternative duel frequency plasma apparatus to be effective with any of the taught gas combinations, hence obvious to use therewith.

Note example 1, gives TEOS flow rates as 50 sccm and NF<sub>3</sub> as 0-500 sccm, depending on layer and trial. As NF<sub>3</sub> has three F, 50 sccm to 0-500 sccm gives 1:(0-30)=14:14(0-30) ratio of Si:F which is inclusive of about 14:1, although from Nishiyama et al's teaching one would expect greater amounts of F to produce larger atom% F in the deposit, while applicant's Fig. 9 appears to be saying just the opposite, ie. that as the ratio of Si to F increases (ie. less F present in reactants with respect to Si) that atomic % F actually goes in the opposite direction (increases), but it is questionable whether this was actually what was meant, since decreasing the fluorine source dos not usually increase the amount of it deposited unless some other parameters is significantly changed. (See comment in section 8).

Art Unit: 1762

(14) Claims 27-29 and 31-34 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 29-33, 38-40 and 42-45 of copending Application No. 08/888,499 in view of Nishiyama et al, for reasons as stated in the action of paper no. 4.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

(15) Claims 27-29 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the PCT reference WO92/20888 to Weise.

Weise teaches the use of halogen etchants, such as CF<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>6</sub>, SiF<sub>4</sub>, etc., (p. 9 and 15) to reduce the defects and amount of hydrogen present as hydroxyl in silicon oxide films deposited by methods inclusive of PECVD (p. 10, 11, 12), using organosilicons such as TEOS (p. 9 and 13), where the intrinsic stress of the deposit is thereby reduced from what it otherwise would have been. This process is controlled by adjusting the ratios of the gases introduced (p. 10 an 15). As the etchant (halogen gas) is taught to directly effect the intrinsic stress, choice of reactant ratio as taught is equivalent to predetermining the stress level due to the inter-relationship. While Weise does not discuss selecting the rate at which the etchant/halogen source is introduce, the parameters of flow rate and reactant ratio are inherently related, such that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that in order to control the ratio of reactant one must select, ie. control their flows. Neither are H-containing fluorocarbons taught, but the obviousness of that difference discussed above in section 11, applies equally here.

Art Unit: 1762

(16)        Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2000 and discussed above and in the 7/20/00 advisory have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(17)        Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to M. L. Padgett at telephone number (703) 308-2336 and FAX (703) 305-5408 (official); and 305-6078 (unofficial).

M. L. Padgett/vr

10-17-00

10-25-00



**MARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1700**